

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS***Summary of the Office Action***

Claims 1-6 have been rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent 6,303,134 (“the ‘134 patent”), claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent 6,491,939 (“the ‘939 patent”), and claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent 6,699,491 (“the ‘491 patent”). Reconsideration of the pending claims is hereby requested.

Discussion of the Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection


Claims 1-6 have been rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-19 of the ‘134 patent, claims 1-4 of the ‘939 patent, and claims 1-4 of the ‘491 patent. While the claims are not identical to one another, the Examiner asserts that pending claims 1-6 are not patentably distinct from the claims of the ‘134, ‘939, and ‘491 patents.

In order to advance prosecution of the instant application, and not in acquiescence of the rejection, Applicant submits herewith a Terminal Disclaimer Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.321 for the instant application and the ‘134, ‘939, and ‘491 patents. Accordingly, the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is believed to be moot, and Applicant requests its withdrawal.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent.

Respectfully submitted,



Kristen J. Harrel, Ph.D., Reg. No. 51,783
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: April 22, 2008